REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 11 and 19-20 are pending. Claims 1, 8 and 19 have been amended. Claim 16 has been cancelled. The specification has been amended. Support for the amendment to the specification is found in original claim 19. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 16, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly anticipated not enabled. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 8 has been amended and no longer recited "foam" rubber.

Claims 1 and 19 are directed to a "flexible" outer edge and "outer edge does not have a rigid or steel rim" respectively. Support for a flexible outer edge is found in the specification at page 2 last paragraph. The specification also calls for a rubber material for the mat that is foldable. Page 4, second paragraph indicates that the mat has elasticity to be reshaped into a flat mat after it has been rolled up into a ball. Further, Figure 3 is a side view of the present invention and Figure 3 shows that the outer edge does not have a rigid or steel rim. Figure 3 shows that the outer edge is rubber and fabric which is known to be flexible and which also follows the spirit of the description for the claimed mat. Additionally, the outer edge is not rigid or it could not be "folded, rolled into a tube or rolled into a ball for portability" as described on page 2, last paragraph. It would be impossible to roll a mat with a steel or rigid outer edge into a shape of a ball and have it be reshaped into a flat mat with ease (page 4, second paragraph). Since it is shown in Figure 3 and is described in the specification to have properties of flexibility in the mat

and outer edges, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are enabled by the specification and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, Claim 19 is supported by Figure 3. There is no rigid or steel rim shown in the mat in Figure 3. Additionally, original claim 19 indicates that the mat is flexible for folding, rolling or balling up for transport.

Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Peters. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As stated above, the mat in claims 1 and 3 has a flexible outer edge. The flexible outer edge in claim 1, as amended, recites that the outer edge is flexible around an entire perimeter of the mat. Peters does not have a flexible outer edge around the entire perimeter of the mat. Peters shows that a steel or rigid rim surrounds the entire perimeter of the mat rendering it inflexible. In Peter, the band serves to give the mat a retained shape. (column 3, lines 10-11).

Therefore, it is submitted that this rejection is overcome.

Claims 4-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Peters in view of Chang. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As stated above, Peters does not disclose a mat that is flexible around the entire perimeter of the mat. Chang is a design patent for an elephant shaped mat. Chang does not state whether the perimeter is flexible or suggest that it would be desirable to have a flexible outer perimeter on a mat made out of soft rubber with a fabric covering. Therefore, neither Peters or Chang would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the present invention.

Claims 5 and 8 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Peters in view of Yamasaki. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Yamasaki has been cited for the use of polyester being used in sitting mats. Yamasaki is directed to a reclining and swingable chair having a polyester cushion. It also has legs. Yamasaki does not make up for the deficiencies in Peters which does not show a laminated rubber mat with a flexible outer edge.

Claims 6, 7 and 16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Peters. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Peters has the rigid rim. The present invention has an outer edge that is flexible around an entire perimeter thereof. Since the mat of the invention is for the use of children, it would not be desirable to have a rigid or steel outer edge because of safety and comfort concerns. Further, the mat in Peters could be dangerous to children with its outer steel rim that folds at a joint. It could pinch children's fingers. Therefore, Peters does not render the present invention obvious and it is believed that this rejection is overcome.

Claims 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pascal in view of Peters. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The mat is Pascal is made of padding with a cover sheet quilted to it. It is not round and the fabric is not laminated thereto. Because it is quilted, it does not have a flat surface. There is no suggestion in Pascal to alter the round mat in Peters to have flexible

outer edges. Pascal is not concerned with shelters as recited in Peters. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is overcome.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that none of the prior art presented discloses the features of the claimed invention as amended. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 20, 2004

By 

Caroline Nash, Reg. No. 36, 329
Nash & Titus, LLC
21402 Unison Road
Middleburg, VA 20117
(540) 554-4551
Customer No. 30951